

ACADEMIC SENATE - - AGENDA
December 7, 1971

- I. Call to order in Faculty/Staff Dining Room at 3:15 p.m.
- II. Approval of minutes of November 9, 1971, meeting.
- III. Business Items
 - A. CBL Committee - Recall procedures for elected representative. (Action Item), Attachment 1.
 - B. CBL Committee - Amendment to Bylaws Section VI-B, paragraph 1.-F. (Action Item), Attachment 2.
 - C. CBL Committee - Amendment to Bylaws Section I. Definitions. (1st reading - No Action), Attachment 3.
 - D. CBL Committee - Amendment to Bylaws Section VI.-B-2. Research Committee. (1st reading - No Action), Attachment 3.
 - E. CBL Committee - Amendment to Bylaws Section VI.-B.-5. dealing with Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee. (1st reading - No Action), Attachment 3.
 - F. General Education and Breadth Requirement Committee of the Academic Senate and Executive Committee. Attachments 4, 4A, 4B.
 - G. Budget Committee - Resolution on Faculty Salary Increases (to be distributed at Senate meeting).
 - H. Personnel Policies Committee - Resolution regarding Administrative Bulletin 70-8. Attachments 5, 5A.
 - I. Executive Committee Motion: The Academic Senate recommends to the President that he request University status for Cal Poly under the new law. Attachment 6.
- IV. Informational and Discussion Items
 - A. Committee Appointments
 - Student Affairs Committee: Bill Jacobs replaces Earl Cosma from the School of Agriculture and Natural Resources.
 - Committee on International Education: _____ replaces N. Cruikshanks from the School of Business and Social Sciences.
 - Research Committee: Jennifer Olson replaces Navnit Doshi as ASI Representative.

A. Committee Appointments (cont.)

- Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee:
Don Hensel is Chairman.
Pete Evans is ASI Representative.
Jane Gaynord is ASI Representative.
- Ad Hoc Committee on Collective Negotiations:
Larry Voss, Chairman Corwin Johnson, CSEA
Barton Olsen, AAUP Dave George, UPC
Al Andreoli, ACSCP David Saveker, A.S.
Norman Eatough, CCUFA
- College/ASI Advisory Commission:
Gordon Paul is Senate Representative.
- EPIC Committee:
Dave Grant is Senate Representative.
- Student Executive Cabinet:
John Mott replaces Earl Cosma.
- Ad Hoc (Executive Committee) on University Status:
Maurice Wilks, Chairman Roger Sherman
John Rogalla Dale Andrews (Advisory)
John Mott

B. Operational Procedures on Catalog Copy. See Attachment 7.

C. Report for statewide Academic Senate members.

D. Report from David H. Provost, Chairman, Academic Senate California State Colleges.

E. Executive Committee Referral to Student Affairs Committee.
Attachment 8.

F. The Executive Committee will meet January 4, 1971, at 3:00 p.m.
in Ag. 138.

G. The Academic Senate will meet January 11, 1971, at 3:00 p.m. in
the Faculty/Staff Dining Hall.

VII. RECALL OF ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES

- A. These procedures for recall shall apply to:
1. Elected members of the Academic Senate, California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo
 2. Elected representatives to the Academic Senate, California State Colleges
 3. Members and/or alternates to the Personnel Review Committee.
- B. An election for recall of elected representatives as specified in Section VII-A-1,2, and 3 may be instituted by a petition of those eligible to vote in the election for the representatives in the various categories provided the following provisions are met.
1. An individual eligible to vote in election for the representative shall notify the Chairman of the Academic Senate of his intention to circulate a recall petition. This notification shall state further the reasons for the recall action in brief terms.
 2. The Chairman of the Academic Senate will notify the Chairman of the Elections Committee and shall notify all of the eligible voters in the area affected of the intended recall petition and state the reasons given for the petition to recall.
 3. The notification will be in effect five days in which classes are in session prior to the circulation of the petition. Signatures on a petition may be obtained for the next ten days in which regular classes are in session so that the recall election, if required, can be instituted no more than 20 days, in which classes are regularly in session, after the start of the recall notification.
 4. The recall petition will be circulated by those initiating the recall action. The top of each sheet heading a list of signatures for recall action shall contain a statement of the reasons for recall.
 5. The dated signatures of at least 20 per cent of those eligible to vote in the area represented by the incumbent as specified in the Constitution and Bylaws of the Academic Senate, California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo, or the Constitution and Bylaws of the Academic Senate, California State Colleges, and validated by the Elections Committee of the Academic Senate shall require the initiation of a recall election.
 6. If the petition is for the recall of a member of the Academic Senate, California State Polytechnic College, or a member or alternate of the Personnel Review Committee, the Chairman of the Elections Committee will appoint a subcommittee of two members of the Elections Committee to conduct the balloting in this election. If the petition is for the recall of a member of the Academic Senate, California State Colleges, the entire Elections Committee shall conduct the balloting in this election.

7. The recall ballot shall be worded so that it can be answered "yes" or "no."

_____ shall be recalled from the
(Name)

(Category of Elected Representative)

The reasons stated in the petition are as follows:

Yes_____ No_____

8. A majority vote of those eligible to vote and voting, as certified by the Elections Committee, will be sufficient to recall the incumbent.
9. If the incumbent is recalled, the Elections Committee will solicit nominees for 10 days in which regular classes are in session from the area where the vacancy now exists.
10. After nominees have been received the Chairman of the Elections Committee will notify the Chairman of the Academic Senate, and all of the faculty members of the school or area affected of the nominees and of the time and place of the election to fill the vacancy created by the recall.
11. The election procedures and ballot counting shall be as provided in these bylaws for regular elections.

Delete from the bylaws Section VI-B, paragraph 1-f which reads as follows:

"An ex-officio member and alternate shall be students, to be elected by the Student Executive Committee, and the students shall have no less than a junior standing and consecutive attendance at Cal Poly for at least three quarters preceeding their election. The students shall be automatically disqualified from reviewing cases of faculty members in their major department and may disqualify themselves where they feel their personal contact with the faculty member is such that it makes an unbiased decision difficult. The alternate shall serve whenever the member is disqualified."

Marianne Doshi suggested an amendment to read as follows:

"That the By-laws Section VI-B, paragraph 1-f be amended to read:

In accordance with the recent Title V change, there shall be a non-voting, non-debating member and alternate who are students, appointed by S.A.C., having two consecutive quarters attendance at Cal Poly."

Chairman Rhoads explained that Mrs. Doshi should present the above suggestion to the CBL Committee for consideration prior to the next Senate meeting when the item is scheduled as a Business "Action" item.

CBL Committee Chairman, Corwin Johnson, announced that the CBL Committee will have an open meeting at 3:00 p.m., November 16th, in the Faculty/Staff Dining Hall. He urged attendance. He also indicated that he would contact the Chancellor's Office for further interpretation of Title V relative to students on the Personnel Review Committee and include the interpretation as part of the report on this item as requested by Mrs. Doshi.

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE

SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA 93401



AGRICULTURE • NATURAL RESOURCES • ENGINEERING & TECHNOLOGY • ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN • COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

November 17, 1971

Dr. Clay Sommers, State College Dean
Faculty and Staff Affairs
California State Colleges
Office of the Chancellor
5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90036

Dear Dr. Sommers:

A question has come up with regard to the involvement of students in the consultation process relating to reappointment, tenure, and promotion of academic personnel. We would appreciate a clarification on the intent of Title V, California Administrative Code in this matter.

Specifically, the question concerns whether a student may be present as a mute observer in meetings of review committees which are deliberating and/or voting on academic personnel actions? For example, it has been proposed to our Academic Senate that a student representative be a non-voting, non-debating member of the Academic Senate's Personnel Review Committee. The student would be appointed by the Student Affairs Council of the Associated Students, Incorporated. The question also may be extended to include representatives from other interested groups, such as non-tenured faculty, alumni, the general public, etc.

Your early written response to this request will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Larry Voss
Director of Personnel Relations

cc: Howard Rhoads, Chairman, Academic Senate

bcc: President Kennedy
✓ Corwin Johnson
Leon Maksudian



The California State Colleges

5670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90036

November 22, 1971

Office of The Chancellor

Mr. Larry R. Voss
Director, Personnel Relations
California State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

Dear Larry:

In your letter of November 17, 1971, you asked whether the intent of Section 42701 of Title 5 would be met by permitting a student appointed by your student government organization to sit as a mute, nonvoting observer at meetings of the Academic Senate's Personnel Review Committee. Personnel committees are encouraged by Section 42701 to "consider information (underline added) from other faculty members and any other source including but not limited to students."

The actual presence--albeit in silence--of a student would appear to contravene the intent of the Trustees that only tenured faculty and appropriate department chairmen and academic administrators participate in deliberations and voting in personnel recommendations. Discussion among personnel committee members must be carried on frankly, governed only by the confidentiality required in such matters, and free of the kind of monitoring which the presence of one limited by Title 5 to the role of an information source would imply.

This reasoning may also be applied to determining the propriety of the presence of other nontenured faculty, alumni, and the other persons you mentioned in your letter. If I may clarify this further, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Clay

Clayton L. Sommers
State College Dean
Faculty Affairs

CLS:jb

xcc: Pres. Kennedy, Corwin Johnson, Howard Rhoads, Leon Maksoudian

I. DEFINITIONS

Add: D. ASI Members of Academic Senate Committees

Unless otherwise specifically stated in these bylaws, the ASI representative shall be a student who is carrying at least seven quarter units and has completed two consecutive quarters and at least 24 quarter units at Cal Poly and have a grade point average of at least 2.0.

First Reading
CBL Committee

VI.- B.- 2. Research Committee

a. Membership

Add: ASI Representative at the end of the first sentence of this paragraph.

First Reading
CBL Committee

VI.- B.- 5. The Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee

The Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee shall be composed of 5 faculty members to be appointed by the Chairman of the Academic Senate with the approval of the Executive Committee and 2 students to be appointed by the ASI. These faculty members will be former recipients of the Distinguished Teaching Award, and will serve a two-year term, except for the first year (1972-73) when 3 of the members will serve a one-year term. No member of this Committee should serve more than one term without an intervening period of at least one year.

The students will be of at least junior standing (have completed at least 90 quarter units of college work) and have had at least three consecutive quarters and completed 36 quarter units at Cal Poly with a grade point average of at least 2.0.

The Committee shall determine the criteria to be used for judging distinguished teachers. Nominees for the award will be received by the Committee during the Fall Quarter, and final selection will be made not later than the sixth week of the Spring Quarter.

Memorandum

To : Howard Rhoads, Chairman
Academic Senate

Date : November 24, 1971

File No.:

Copies :

From : Nelson Smith III, Chairman
General Education & Breadth Committee

Subject: Action Item - Ad Hoc Committee Report

The members of the General Education & Breadth Committee have directed me to inform the Senate of the following actions.

1. The Committee rescinded the recommendation submitted at the November 9th Senate meeting by a vote of 6 for, 3 opposed.
2. The committee failed to endorse the Ad Hoc Committee's report without amendment by a vote of 6 opposed, 1 for, 2 abstentions.
3. The Committee voted 8 for, 1 abstention that "the Committee be given until the end of Winter quarter, 1972, to present a meaningful recommendation and further that the Senate delay action until such a meaningful recommendation can be made."

This means that the Senate (you) would not be able to make a recommendation to President Kennedy until after the deadline for department heads to submit catalog changes to their deans. However, it is the feeling of the Committee that if a meaningful recommendation is not made at this time (since changes would not be possible until the 1975-77 catalog), the Committee would be failing to meet its obligations to the college, the faculty, and the students.

I am not sure how this should be handled since it is an action item. I leave it to the Executive Committee's discretion.

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE
San Luis Obispo

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COLLEGE-WIDE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
AS MODIFIED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEE
ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH

November 9, 1971

Natural Sciences

At least 15 units chosen from courses in the natural sciences, with at least one course in life science (Bact, Bio, Cons, Ent, Zoo), and at least one course in physical science (Ast, Chem, Geol, PSc, Phys). ~~Up to 24 units~~

- 1 "Broadly-based" course work in the Schools of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Architecture and Environmental Design, or Engineering and Technology may be counted in this category, provided that these units are taken outside the School in which the student is enrolled. No more than three
- 2 courses having the same prefix may be counted to satisfy the natural science requirement. Maximum ~~24~~ 24 units.

Social Sciences

At least 9 units chosen from courses in Ant, Ec, Geog, Pol Sci, Psych, Soc Sc, Soc. All students must take Pol Sci 201. No more than two courses having the same prefix may be counted in this category. Maximum 16 units.

Humanities

- 3 At least 15 units, including Hist 204, Hist 205, and two courses in literature (Eng) and/or philosophy. No more than 3 units each in Art, Dr, Mu, nor 6 units in Hist, may be counted in this category. Maximum ~~24~~ 24 units.

Basic Subjects

Mathematical sciences (CSc, Math, Stat) (at least a 3 unit course), written communication (Eng) (one course), oral (Sp) or written communication (at least one course). Minimum 12 units, maximum 16 units

- 4 Breadth
Other/Subjects

Physical education (3 to 5 units, at the option of individual Schools)

- 5 Any 9 to 7 units (depending upon P.E. requirements of individual Schools), provided that these additional units are taken outside the school in which the student is enrolled.

Elaboration of recommended changes by the Academic Senate Committee
on General Education and Breadth

1. The committee endorses the concept of adding broadly-based course work in agriculture, architecture and engineering to the general education portion of the college's curriculum. However, for various reasons, the main one being the

definition of natural science, the committee recommended the transfer of the circled sentence to the last category, "Other Breadth Subjects." The opening phrase, "Up to six units of" was deleted. This action will permit up to nine units permissible in the "Other Breadth Subjects" category. The vote on relocation was 8 to 0 with one abstention.

2. The committee unanimously recommends a return to the present maximum of 24 units in the Natural Sciences category.
3. The committee unanimously recommends that a maximum of 24 units be set for the Humanities category. This merely acknowledges the shift of six units of history from Social Sciences to Humanities and, as in the case of Natural Sciences, retains the present maximum. The vote was unanimous.
4. The word, Breadth, is unanimously recommended as a clarifying addition.

Memorandum

To : ✓ Howard Rhoads, Chairman, Academic Senate
Nelson Smith, Chairman, General Education
Committee

Date : November 1, 1971

File No.:

Copies :

From : Chester Young

Subject: General Education Breadth Requirements

The following is quoted from the minutes of Academic Council meeting of October 18, 1971. If the Academic Senate reaction is similar, the new General Education Requirements can be promulgated immediately.

"C. General Education Breadth Requirement for 1973-75
(Attachment 2-4, See Minutes of Meeting No. 2)

"During the discussion on this item attention was focused on three items.

1. Whether or not it was appropriate to include courses in the School of Architecture and Environmental Design under the category of Natural Sciences.
2. Whether or not the physical education requirement should remain at five rather than the proposed minimum of three.
3. Whether or not the maxima as presented in the attachment for each category were appropriate.

"Following discussion by the Council, the following actions were taken:

It was moved, seconded and approved to add the prefix 'Botany' in the Natural Sciences category.

It was moved, seconded and approved to change the wording in the final section under 'Other Subjects' from 'school' to 'department.' (This would make that particular section read: 'Any 9 to 7 units depending upon P.E. requirements of individual Schools, provided that these additional units are taken outside the department in which the student is enrolled.')

It was moved, seconded and approved to substitute the word 'will' for the word 'may' in the last sentence under Natural Sciences, Social Sciences and Humanities.

It was then moved, seconded and approved to retain the maxima at 24 for the Natural Sciences instead of the proposed 22.

"With these amendments, it was moved, seconded and approved that the Academic Council endorse the proposed General Education Requirements for 1973-75 as amended."

Howard Rhoads:

This is the quote from the Academic Council minutes, ~~at~~ which we discussed by phone this morning. As I suggested to you then, it would be of help to the instructional departments if the revised General Education requirements could be finalized soon in order that their catalog copy for 1973-75 can be completed.


Chris

Memorandum

To : Dale W. Andrews, Chairman, Academic Council Date : September 24, 1971
Howard Rhoads, Chairman, Academic Senate

File No.:

Copies : Messrs. Dettloff
Dunigan
West

From : Robert E. Kennedy 

Subject: General Education Breadth Requirement for 1973-75

Last February I appointed a special Ad Hoc College-Wide General Education Committee to assist in reconciling differences of opinion regarding recommendations which emanated from the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee. The Ad Hoc Committee was comprised of seven faculty members representing the Schools with Erland Dettloff as Chairman, and two staff members to provide liaison. The basic responsibility of this committee was to develop a general education breadth proposal most appropriate for students graduating from our degree programs, taking into consideration, of course, the work already done toward that end by previous committees.

The Ad Hoc Committee has made a report and recommendation to me which I find quite acceptable. I believe the Committee has done a very good job with a very difficult assignment. It is my present plan to ask that it be implemented unless there are insurmountable obstacles. However, as was stated in the February 16, 1971 memo appointing the Committee, I would like to have the benefit of review and comment both by the Academic Senate and the Academic Council before taking final action. It would be appreciated if you would take the necessary steps in that direction as soon as possible. A copy of the report is attached.

Attachment

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE
San Luis Obispo

REPORT OF AD HOC COLLEGE-WIDE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Natural Sciences

At least 15 units chosen from courses in the natural sciences, with at least one course in life science (Bact, Bio, Cons, Ent, Zoo), and at least one course in physical science (Ast, Chem, Geol, PSc, Phys). Up to six units of "broadly-based" course work in the Schools of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Architecture and Environmental Design, or Engineering and Technology may be counted in this category, provided that these units are taken outside the School in which the student is enrolled. No more than three courses having the same prefix may be counted to satisfy the natural science requirement. Maximum 22 units.

Social Sciences

At least 9 units chosen from courses in Ant, Ec, Geog, Pol Sci, Psych, Soc Sc, Soc. All students must take Pol Sci 201. No more than two courses having the same prefix may be counted in this category. Maximum 16 units.

Humanities

At least 15 units, including Hist. 204, Hist. 205, and two courses in literature (Eng) and/or philosophy. No more than 3 units each in Art, Dr, Mu, nor 6 units in Hist, may be counted in this category. Maximum 21 units.

Basic Subjects

Mathematical sciences (CSc, Math, Stat) (at least a 3 unit course), written communication (Eng) (one course), oral (Sp) or written communication (at least one course). Minimum 12 units, maximum 16 units.

Other Subjects

Physical education (3 to 5 units, at the option of individual Schools)

Any 9 to 7 units (depending upon P. E. requirements of individual Schools), provided that these additional units are taken outside the school in which the student is enrolled.

		SUMMARY			
		Proposed			
		<u>1973-74</u>		<u>Basic Changes</u>	
	<u>1970-71</u>				
	Min.	Max.	Min.	Max.	
Natural Sciences	15	24	15	22	Added option of "up to six units of 'broadly-based' work in the Schools of Agr., Arch., Engin."
Social Sciences	15	21	9	16	Hist. 204 and 205 removed from this category.
Humanities	9	18	15	21	Hist. 204 and 205 added to align with placement of Hist. in the School of Communicative Arts and Humanities.
Basic Subjects	<u>12</u>	16	<u>12</u>	16	No changes.
Sub-Total	51		51		
Other Subjects			51	--51	
P. E.			3	to 5	Permits individual Schools flexibility in determining P. E. requirements within the 3 to 5 range. No specific P. E. units a general requirement.
Other			<u>9</u>	to <u>7</u>	Additional units must be taken outside the student's School, rather than his major.
TOTAL			63	63	

THE ACADEMIC SENATE, CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE,
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

PERSONNEL POLICIES

The "open-file" personnel policy as outlined in Administrative Bulletin 70-8 has been reviewed as stipulated in President Kennedy's announcement of October 15, 1970, by the Personnel Policies Committee of the Academic Senate.

The review has included consultation with campus personnel who have had experience with its implementation and continuing operation.

It is the Committee's assessment that the policy has not been in operation sufficiently long to permit a definitive evaluation.

While some concern was indicated that the wells of significant information may be drying up when unsigned statements cannot be deposited in a faculty personnel file, the Committee calls attention to the College Administrative Manual, Section 341.1 D, which states:

"Evaluative statements should be validated with reliable evidence such as class visitation, measurement of student achievement, course outlines, and tests, committee work, publications, opinion of peers, students, and statement of the individual faculty member. If the evidence is not satisfactory, or if it does not appear to support the recommendations made, the file will be returned to the reviewing levels for amplification".

The Committee feels that the CAM statement insures that significant and reliable information is made available. The Committee, however, is concerned that some may be content with providing the validation of the majority opinion. The Committee cautions that validation must include evidence to support the minority determination as well as the majority.

The Committee recommends the adoption of the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the Interim Policy and Procedures Statement on Faculty Personnel Files designated as Administrative Bulletin 70-8 was promulgated by President Kennedy on October 15, 1970, and,

WHEREAS, President Kennedy, in his cover attachment to Administrative Bulletin 70-8 stated that it is for use during the 1970-71 cycle of faculty personnel actions, after which it will again be subjected to review for any needed revisions; now, therefore, be it,

RESOLVED, that Administrative Bulletin 70-8 be amended to read as follows:

1. Section II - A

The official personnel file shall contain all materials pertinent to the progress and welfare of the individual

faculty member after initial appointment, including, but not limited to, performance evaluations, letters of reference, and other documents which in judgment of the custodian may be useful in personnel matters, but shall exclude published articles, papers or books by the subject and such other documents as payroll, insurance, and retirement records.

2. Change in Section II - B

Copies of material may be made by the faculty member except that if a letter or other document has been submitted by a single individual, a copy may be made only upon the written approval by the individual submitting the document. Any person violating this procedure shall be subject to disciplinary action. A written record must be kept in the file indicating who has had access to the file and on what date; and be it further,

RESOLVED, that the word "Interim" be stricken from the title of Administrative Bulletin - 70-8; and be it further,

RESOLVED, that Administrative Bulletin 70-8, Policy and Procedures Statement on Faculty Personnel Files be continued as amended with evaluation required when necessitated by experience.

Statement and resolution unanimously
recommended by Personnel Policy
Committee

November 30, 1971

INTERIM POLICY AND PROCEDURES STATEMENT ON
FACULTY PERSONNEL FILES

The attached policy and procedures statement governing maintenance of and access to faculty personnel files is hereby promulgated.

The statement was first drafted by the College's Academic Senate, based on a policy statement developed by the Statewide Academic Senate as recommended by that body to the Chancellor. (The Chancellor's Office action on the Statewide Academic Senate's recommendation is still pending.)

The first draft of the Cal Poly Academic Senate's recommended version was reviewed by the Chancellor's Office of the Legal Counsel and by the Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs, revised in accordance with suggestions made by those offices, and again submitted for review to the College's school deans and Academic Senate. It is promulgated on an interim basis for use during the 1970-71 cycle of faculty personnel actions, after which it will again be subjected to review for any needed revisions. If a systemwide policy on this subject is promulgated by the Chancellor, the attached statement will be reviewed and, if necessary, revised for conformance with the systemwide policy; any such revision will be subjected to appropriate consultation.


Robert E. Kennedy
President

Date October 15, 1970

Note: This Administrative Bulletin should be filed in the Appendix of the College Administrative Manual, and its title added to the CAM Index. It represents recently approved college policy and/or procedures; its contents should be called to the attention of all users of your copy of CAM.

INTERIM POLICY AND PROCEDURES STATEMENT ON
FACULTY PERSONNEL FILES

- I. The official personnel file, being that file maintained in the office of the school dean or division head and containing all the materials which form the basis for decisions in personnel actions, including reappointment, tenure, promotion, and separation, shall be open to inspection by the individual faculty member who is the subject of the file and by a committee or administrator authorized to review the file in the course of official personnel business. Such files are maintained under the custody of the appropriate administrative officer (i.e., the college librarian, school deans, division heads, vice presidents) for all rank-and-class employees, professional librarians, and other academic-related employees. The custodian of the files is responsible to the College President for their maintenance in accordance with this policy.
 - A. The following committees shall be authorized to have access to the files: Personnel Review Committee, Grievance Committee and Disciplinary Action Committee. Such access shall be only by the specific committee dealing with a case and only to the file concerned.
 - B. Administrative personnel who are authorized to have access to the files are: the Department Head of the faculty member who is subject of the file, the Academic Dean and Associate Dean of the school, the Director of Personnel, the Academic Vice President, the President, and any additional person or committee acting pursuant to official business the President shall designate following consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.
- II. Materials shall be placed in faculty personnel files by administrative personnel and/or department committees charged with personnel matters and by the individual who is the subject of the file.
 - A. The official personnel file shall contain all materials pertinent to the progress and welfare of the individual faculty member after initial appointment, including, but not limited to, performance evaluations, letters of reference, and other documents which in the judgment of the custodian may be useful in personnel matters, but shall exclude documents such as payroll, insurance, and retirement records.
 - B. A method shall be established within each school or division which permits the faculty member to read the material included in his file upon implementation of this policy and at any future time that other material is added. The method adopted shall be exact and administered in a proper and efficient manner to assure the maintenance of these files as confidential and privileged information. Copies of material may be made by the faculty member except that if a letter or other document has been submitted by a single individual, a copy may be made only upon the written approval by the individual submitting the document. A written record must be kept

in the file indicating who has had access to the file and on what date.

- C. Any adverse written evaluations received about a faculty member from on campus shall be destroyed or returned by the file custodian to the originator if the writer does not agree to their inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file in accord with this policy. No written evaluation in which the author is not identified shall be retained.
- D. Letters of recommendation or confidential placement files used in the course of the original appointment of the subject faculty member shall constitute an exception to the access rule in I. Such material shall be kept in the file in a sealed envelope appropriately labeled to indicate the nature of the contents and that the subject faculty member shall not have access. Material to which the faculty member is not to have access shall be temporarily removed from the file when the file is made available to the faculty member for his inspection. At the end of the fourth full year of full-time rank-and-class employment such material may be destroyed by the file custodian or returned to the originator if so requested.
- E. Prior to implementation of access policy as stated in I, individuals from whom recommendations and statements have been obtained in confidence and which are present in current files shall be asked to acquiesce to review of their statements by the subject faculty member.
 - 1. Refusal to grant permission for the subject faculty member to review such statements shall result in the removal and return to the author of the pertinent document(s) or note(s).
 - 2. Any materials in the subject faculty member's file which were obtained from individuals since deceased, or otherwise not available, shall be removed from the file on the agreement of the subject faculty member and the dean; or the materials, if retained, shall be noted as not having been cleared by the writer. Such material, when retained, will be made available for review by the subject faculty member.

III. Removal, amendment and/or response to personnel file materials.

- A. Materials may be removed from the personnel file specified in Section II A:
 - 1. By mutual consent of the faculty member and the dean, initiated by either party; or,
 - 2. If the dean or the faculty member does not consent, by appeal of either party to the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate, which shall determine whether the request for removal shall be granted. If the parties involved do not concur in this determination, it may be appealed to the President.
- B. The subject faculty member may seek amendment of materials which he regards as being erroneous or misleading by the same procedure as in III A.
- C. In accordance with established procedures in grievance or disciplinary action cases, materials may be removed from the subject faculty member's file provided that the faculty member is so notified.

D. The subject faculty member may forward to the file custodian for addition to his file any materials which he regards as a pertinent response to any other materials contained in his file.

1. The addition of any materials which in the judgement of the school dean are derogatory to any other faculty or administrative staff members shall be an exception to the right to add materials.

Memorandum

To : Executive Committee, Academic Senate
c/o Howard Rhoads ✓

Date : November 30, 1971

File No.:

Copies : Wilson, Andrews

From : Robert E. Kennedy

Subject: University Status

You are aware that on May 9, 1967, when the predecessor organization to the Academic Senate (the Faculty-Staff Council) was reacting to a previous name-change bill unsuccessfully introduced in 1967, the faculty recommended to me that "we should attempt to maintain our concept and name 'Polytechnic' in any anticipated future name changes." Subsequent to that 1967 legislation, every bill that was introduced to change the name of the State Colleges to University included an amendment which would have achieved the objective of retaining the name "Polytechnic" in the title. AB 123 which was signed into law yesterday by Governor Reagan includes provision that this institution, if approved for University status, would be called California Polytechnic State University.

There are advantages that would accrue to this institution if it were to bear the name "California Polytechnic State University." I will not attempt to enumerate them as the faculty are as aware of these advantages as I am. However, one disadvantage would appear obvious and that would be for ten or twelve of the existing State Colleges to achieve University status while the remaining seven or eight institutions were denied that title. It was the possibility of this second class citizenship role which prompted me on a previous bill to have Senator Grunsky amend it to include all of the existing State Colleges without regard to any criteria to be established by the Trustees or the Coordinating Council. This was not, however, the bill that was passed. The bill that was passed does require the Trustees and the Coordinating Council to establish criteria and that criteria is now being developed for Trustee consideration by the Chancellor's office. The criteria will also be reviewed by the staff of the Coordinating Council for consideration by that body.

I am attaching a copy of a clipping from this morning's LOS ANGELES TIMES written by William Trombley, the TIMES Education writer. The clipping includes the statement:

November 30, 1971

"It is not thought likely that university status will be awarded the two Cal Polys, at Pomona and San Luis Obispo, or to Stanislaus State or to the newest schools--Bakersfield, Dominguez Hills, San Bernardino and Sonoma State."

I would appreciate having from the Academic Senate as soon as possible the faculty's recommendation on two items:

- (1) Should we press for immediate University status under the new law?
- (2) What criteria for University status should we consider recommending through proper channels.

It is my understanding that the bill will not become law until sixty days after the end of the current legislative session. This could mean that some of the State Colleges might obtain University status as early as March of next year.

College Name Change Bill Signed by Reagan

Some Uncertainty Exists as to How Many
of 19 Campuses Will Become Universities

BY WILLIAM TROMBLEY

Times Education Writer

Gov. Reagan signed a bill Monday renaming the California state college system "California State University and Colleges" but it is not clear how many of the 19 colleges will become universities.

Reagan has said all 19 campuses, ranging in size from Cal State Bakersfield (1,500 students this fall) to Cal State Long Beach (23,450) should be given the new name because "all of them are engaged in quality teaching."

"To call some campuses 'state colleges' and others 'state universities' would imply differences in teaching standards which, in reality, do not exist within the system," Reagan said last week in announcing his intention to sign the bill.

However, the legislation calls for the State College Board of Trustees and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education jointly to determine which colleges should be renamed universities and it is not likely this process will be altogether harmonious.

Proposed Criteria

For instance, the "quality teaching" mentioned by the governor does not appear at all in a set of proposed criteria for university status drawn up by the Coordinating Council staff in May, 1969.

These criteria said a college, in order to be renamed a university, should have the following qualifications:

—A full range of undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and sciences and degrees in at least two professional fields.

—Graduate work at the doctoral level in three distinct academic areas.

—Adequate resources such as faculty, libraries and laboratories to carry out all programs.

Few Will Qualify

If the Coordinating Council accepts these criteria, or anything like them, very few of the state colleges would qualify for university status.

However, Owen A. Knorr, staff director of the Coordinating Council, said Monday he considered the 1969 criteria "pretty stiff" and said he has started working on a new set.

State College Chancellor

Glenn S. Dumke said at the bill-signing ceremony in Sacramento Monday that "well over half" of the 19 state colleges already merit the new name.

Dumke urged the trustees and the Coordinating Council to agree on criteria that would grant "this accolade" to all but the "very newest" of the state colleges — presumably Bakersfield, Cal State Dominguez Hills, Cal State San Bernardino and perhaps Sonoma State.

Staff Study Planned

Dumke has appointed Vice Chancellor William B. Langsdorf to conduct a staff study of proposed criteria for university status.

The chancellor said he hopes to present these criteria to the Board of Trustees when it meets in Los Angeles next Jan. 25-26 and to the Coordinating Council at a meeting in Sacramento Feb. 8, 1972.

Most observers assume university status will be conferred quickly upon the largest of the state colleges—Long Beach, Cal State Los Angeles, San Francisco State, San Jose State and San Diego State.

Cal State Fullerton, Sacramento State and San Fernando Valley State also are considered likely candidates for the new name.

Status of Others

There is less certainty about Chico State, Fresno State, Humboldt State and Cal State Hayward.

It is not thought likely that university status will be awarded to the two Cal Polys, at Pomona and San Luis Obispo, or to Stanislaus State, or to the newest schools — Bakersfield, Dominguez Hills, San Bernardino and Sonoma State.

At the bill-signing ceremony Gov. Reagan assured opponents of the legislation, including University of California officials, that he and Dumke will not "allow this to become a duplication and an overlapping of functions" with UC.

However, UC President Charles J. Hitch, who was waiting outside to discuss the university's 1972-73 budget with the governor, said the name change would be "very confusing."

"Too many places are called universities already," Hitch said.

State of California

California State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

Memorandum

To : Howard Rhoads
Chairman, Academic Senate

Date : October 28, 1971

File No.:

Copies :

From : D. John Price
Chairman, Curriculum Committee

Subject: Curriculum Committee Procedures

Academic Senate Curriculum Committee Procedures On Catalog Copy

1. Assign coordinators for each school.
2. Chairman of committee receives all curriculum proposals.
3. Chairman distributes school curriculum proposals to the assigned committee member.
4. Curriculum is reviewed by committee member and any question the committee member has regarding a particular proposal, the committee member discusses with the respective department.
5. Discussion and action by committee on proposal. Preceded by an invitation to each department in the school to send a resource person if the department so desires.
6. Recommendations made by the committee are now sent to the Academic Senate.

To: Student Affairs Committee

From: Executive Committee of Academic Senate

You are requested to study and report to the Executive Committee concerning the implementation and publicity of existing channels of student input regarding the faculty personnel review processes. This review should include, but not be limited to, student input to the departmental tenured committees.

It is the hope of the Executive Committee that if students were better informed about opportunities to influence personnel decisions, some of the pressure to create new evaluation avenues would be reduced.

H. Scales
Education